

1 Lara T. Kollios (State Bar No. 235395)
2 lkollios@jonesday.com
3 Chantelle C. Egan (State Bar No. 257938)
4 cegan@jonesday.com
5 JONES DAY
6 555 California Street, 26th Floor
7 San Francisco, CA 94104
8 Telephone: (415) 626-3939
9 Facsimile: (415) 875-5700

10 Hugh R. Whiting (admitted *pro hac vice*)
11 hrwhiting@jonesday.com
12 JONES DAY
13 North Point
14 901 Lakeside Avenue
15 Cleveland, OH 44114
16 Telephone: (216) 586-3939
17 Facsimile: (216) 579-0212

18 Attorneys for Defendant
19 THE PROCTER & GAMBLE CO.

20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
21 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

22 CHERISH M. SMITH, as an individual, and
23 on behalf of all other similarly situated,

24 Plaintiff,

25 v.
26 THE PROCTER & GAMBLE CO., a Ohio
corporation doing business as CREST,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:12-cv-00557-EDL
**JOINT STIPULATION AND
[PROPOSED] ORDER FOR STAY**

27 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-1(a), Plaintiff Cherish M. Smith, individually and on
28 behalf of a purported class (“Plaintiffs”) and Defendant The Procter & Gamble Company
 (“Defendant”) (jointly referred to herein as the “Parties”), through their duly authorized
 undersigned counsel, stipulate and request as follows:

27 WHEREAS, currently, there are four separate lawsuits (including the above-captioned
28 matter) now pending in four different federal district courts, all filed within about three months,

JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER FOR STAY

1 and all asserting similar claims based on allegations about marketing Crest Sensitivity Treatment
 2 & Protection toothpaste (“Crest STP”) – the other three cases are:

- 3 • *Rossi v. The Procter and Gamble Company*, D.N.J., Case No. 2:11-cv-07238-JLL-MAH
 4 (“*Rossi*”)
- 5 • *Gilbert v. The Procter & Gamble Company*, S.D. Ohio, Case No. 1:12-cv-00040-TSB
 6 (“*Gilbert*”)
- 7 • *Immerman v. The Procter & Gamble Company*, N.D. Ohio, Case No. 1:12-cv-00068
 8 (“*Immerman*”);

9 WHEREAS, these cases all seek class certification and allege misleading marketing
 10 practices related to Crest STP;

11 WHEREAS, there are some substantive differences among the claims, they involve the
 12 same core group of allegations;

13 WHEREAS, *Rossi* seeks certification of both a nationwide and a New Jersey-only class,
 14 *Gilbert* seeks certification of an Ohio-only class, *Immerman* seeks certification of both a
 15 nationwide and an Ohio-only class, and here, Plaintiffs seek certification of California-only class;

16 WHEREAS, on February 7, 2012, *Gilbert* filed a motion with the JPML to transfer all of
 17 these actions to the Southern District of Ohio pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407. (MDL No. 2348,
 18 Docket No. 1.), Plaintiff in this case filed a response on February 8 in support of consolidation
 19 and transfer seeking transfer to the Northern District of California, *Immerman* filed a response on
 20 February 28 with the JPML opposing the motion for transfer while arguing for transfer to the
 21 Northern District of Ohio if the JPML were to grant the transfer motion (MDL No. 2348, Docket
 22 No. 16.), *Rossi* filed a response with the JPML on February 28 supporting the motion for transfer
 23 and seeking transfer to the District of New Jersey, and on March 13, 2012, Defendant filed a
 24 response in support of transfer of all of these actions to the Southern District of Ohio (MDL No.
 25 2348, Docket No. 18);

26 WHEREAS, the Parties believe that staying this case until the JPML’s ruling on the
 27 transfer motion will avoid conflicts, conserve resources, and will otherwise promote efficient
 28 determination of the actions. An example of the need for transfer to avoid conflicting rulings on

1 key questions and to conserve judicial resources, is the motions to dismiss for lack of subject-
2 matter jurisdiction which Defendant has filed in all four cases. These motions raise similar issues
3 of fact and law, they should be reviewed and decided consistently and efficiently, and they should
4 not be the subject of four separate judicial considerations and potentially conflicting rulings;

5 WHEREAS, three of the four courts have already entered case management schedules
6 which conflict with one another and will cause unnecessary duplication and confusion if each
7 case proceeds independently;

8 WHEREAS, the parties have entered stipulations to stay proceedings in the *Gilbert* and
9 *Immerman* cases.

10 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between the parties, through their respective
11 counsel, that the case be stayed until further notice, including a stay of the May 22, 2012 Case
12 Management Conference and all related pretrial matters until the pending request before the
13 Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (“JPML”)—in a case that is substantially similar or
14 identical to this case—can be decided.

15

16 **IT IS SO STIPULATED.**

17 Dated: April 6, 2012

/s/ Benjamin M. Lopatin

18 Benjamin M. Lopatin (State Bar No. 281730)
19 LAW OFFICES OF HOWARD W.
RUBINSTEIN, P.A.
20 One Embarcadero Center, Suite 500
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone (888) 560-4480, ext. 2
Facsimile (415) 692-6607

21

22 *Attorney for Plaintiff Cherish M. Smith,
Individually and on behalf all others similarly
situated*

23

24 ///

25

26 ///

27

28 ///

1 Dated: April 6, 2012

2 /s/ Lara T. Kollios
3 Lara T. Kollios (State Bar No. 235395)
4 lkollios@jonesday.com
5 JONES DAY
6 555 California Street, 26th Floor
7 San Francisco, CA 94105
8 Telephone: (415) 626-3939
9 Facsimile: (415) 875-5700

10 Hugh R. Whiting (admitted *pro hac vice*)
11 hrwhiting@jonesday.com
12 Ohio Bar No. 0015067
13 JONES DAY
14 North Point
15 901 Lakeside Avenue
16 Cleveland, OH 44114
17 Telephone: (216) 586-3939
18 Facsimile: (216) 579-0212

19 *Attorneys for Defendant*
20 *The Procter & Gamble Company*

21 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

22 Dated: April 10, 2012, 2012

23 
24 Magistrate Judge Elizabeth D. Laporte

25 Dated: April __, 2012

26 Respectfully submitted,

27 Jones Day

28 By: _____

29 Lara Kollios

30 Counsel for Defendant

ATTESTATION PURSUANT TO GENERAL ORDER 45

I, Lara Kolios, attest that I obtained the concurrence of Benjamin M. Lopatin in the filing of this document. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the forgoing is true and correct. Executed this 6th day of April, 2012, in San Francisco, California.

Dated: April 6, 2012

JONES DAY,

By: /s/ Lara Kollios
Lara Kollios

Attorneys for Defendant
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE CO.